

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 15-20, 23, 24 and 27-29 are amended. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Brier and Woods at the personal interview held May 1, 2006, and by Examiner Woods at the telephone interview held May 15, 2006, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interviews as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interviews.

I. Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 15-20, 23, 24 and 27-29 are amended to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions made during the interview. Specifically, claims 1, 11, 12 and 15-20 are amended to replace "time condition" with "time duration," because the Examiners asserted during the personal interview that "time condition" may be indefinite. Thus, as agreed during the personal interview, amended claims 1, 11, 12 and 15-20 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 6, 12, 16, 17, 20 and 27-29 are amended to replace "generates, deletes or updates," with "at least one of generation, update and deletion," because the Examiners asserted during the personal interview that these claims may not satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 because they also recite "at least one of generation, deletion and update." This amendment clarifies that the input device can perform an input related to generating and/or deleting and/or updating the objection information and/or the service information, and the object information processing device can generate and/or update and/or delete the objection information and/or the service information (paragraphs [0207] - [0212], and MPEP §2173.05h). Thus, as agreed during the personal and telephone interviews, amended claims 6, 12, 16, 17, 20 and 27-29 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 15-17 and 28 are amended to recite "program stored on a computer readable medium," because the Examiner asserted these claims may not satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Thus, as agreed during the personal interview, amended claims 15-17 and 28 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claims 23 and 24 are amended for form. Thus, no new matter is added.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. Claims 1-7 and 9-26

The January 25, 2006 Office Action rejects claims 1-7 and 9-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,317 to Glorikian. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, Glorikian does not disclose "the object information including information, the information providing a time duration for construction of the virtual object," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 11, 12 and 15-20.

Thus, as agreed during the personal interview, independent claims 1, 11, 12 and 15-20 are patentable over Glorikian. Further, claims 2-7, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 21-26, which variously depend from the independent claims, are also patentable over Glorikian for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for they additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. Claim 8

The January 25, 2006 Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Glorikian in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,326,918 to Stewart. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 would not have been rendered obvious by Glorikian in view of Stewart. Stewart does not remedy the deficiencies of Glorikian discussed above with respect to claim independent 1. Claim 8 depends from claim 1. Thus, claim 8 is patentable over Glorikian

and Stewart for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-29 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hs

Date: June 16, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
